DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 089 CS 009 088

AUTHOR Mason, Jana M.; And Others
TITLE Reading and Writing Attempts by Kindergarten Children after Book Reading by Teachers. Technical Report No. 419.
INSTITUTION Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.; Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for the Study of Reading.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jan 88
CONTRACT 400-81-0030
NOTE 22p.; Portions of this paper were presented at the Conference on Reading and Writing Connections (Urbana-Champaign, IL, October 19-21, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Reading; Kindergarten; Picture Books; Primary Education; Reader Text Relationship; *Reading Aloud to Others; Reading Comprehension; Reading Research; *Reading Writing Relationship; Recall (Psychology); *Story Reading
IDENTIFIERS *Beginning Writing; Childrens Writing; Expository Text; Narrative Text; *Text Types

ABSTRACT

Investigating the extent to which reading to children and book type affect kindergartners' ability to recall, write about, and read the text that their teacher has just read to them, a study examined the effects that the story reading techniques of six kindergarten teachers had on 52 of their students during three book reading sessions. On three successive days the teachers read three different types of books--a narrative, an expository text, and a picture-phrase book--to their classes during a videotaped session. Immediately after the story was read, each preselected child was taken from the classroom individually and asked to tell about the book he or she had just heard. First, the children were given a blank piece of paper and pencil and asked to write anything that they could remember about the book. Then, probe questions were asked, and finally, the children were asked to read, or "pretend-read," as much of the book as they could. Results indicated that children were strongly affected by the type of book read to them, showing better performance on all measures with the picture-phrase book. Children's reading was moderately correlated with their writing, but probe recall of texts was not correlated with either reading or writing. (Nine tables are included and 29 references are appended.) (MM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED293089

# CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF READING

## A READING RESEARCH AND EDUCATION CENTER REPORT

Technical Report No. 419

# READING AND WRITING ATTEMPTS BY KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN AFTER BOOK READING BY TEACHERS

Jana M. Mason
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Carol L. Peterman
Portland State University
Barbara Powell
Bonnie M. Kerr
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

January 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Center for the Study of Reading
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Portions of this paper were presented at the Conference on Reading and Writing Connections sponsored by the Center for the Study of Writing at Berkeley and the Center for the Study of Reading at the University of Illinois held in Urbana-Champaign, October 19-21, 1986. The Conference was funded by the United States Department of Education through Grant No. OERI-G-86-0004 awarded to the University of California. This paper will also appear in J. Mason (Ed.), Reading and Writing Connections. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon. We would like to thank Carolyn Eckerty, Marjorie Klein, Jane Maehr, Becky McCabe, Diane Mortensen, Prudence Runkel, and Halestine Session for their support and ideas about reading to children.

CS005088

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Abstract**

Two questions about reading and writing connections were explored: (a) How does book reading to kindergarten children affect their reading, writing, and text recall, and (b) Does the type of book read to children make a difference. Six kindergarten teachers read three types of books to their children: a narrative, an expository text, and a picture-phrase book. Directly following the reading, 8 to 10 children from each classroom were tested individually on their ability to write, read, and remember the book they had just heard. The type of book read to the children affected the content of children's writing, their responses to probe questions, and their ability to read selected pages. Performance with the picture-phrase book was better on all measures than performance with the other two books. Children's reading was moderately correlated with their writing, but probe recall of texts was not correlated with either reading or writing.

# READING AND WRITING ATTEMPTS BY KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN AFTER BOOK READING BY TEACHERS

Young children benefit from home and school experiences that feature talking and writing about their own language. According to Harste, Woodward, and Burke (1984) and Allen (in press), children need to attend to important language features in informal ways in order to understand and learn about written language. Informal activities, those that are organized by the teacher as well as activities that children choose themselves, may enable children to learn and progress at their own rate, as well as to predict and test hypotheses about how written language differs from their own oral language. In this paper, we suggest that learning about written language occurs when teachers read books to students, talk to them about the book contents, and arrange for them to try reading and writing about what they have heard.

We know that oral language is organized differently from written materials and serves different functions, details about which Perena (1984) presents in a book on the subject. Furthermore, we know that there are substantial differences among written texts. Consider, for example, how differently a newspaper, a novel, and a science textbook are organized, and how all of these differ from a conversation between two people. While the same words could appear in each one, the organization of sentences and paragraphs would certainly be dissimilar. There is no doubt that children need to notice how their oral language can be used to form written language and then learn varying ways that written texts are organized in order to become good readers and writers.

Based on assumptions about the process of learning to read as well as the nature of adult-child interactions surrounding story book reading, it is likely that children refine their understanding of language when adults read to them. It is fortunate, indeed, that many parents and teachers read to young children, presumably helping them form a bridge from oral to written language so that they can begin to analyze the distinguishing features of written language.

We believe that book reading allows children to focus on the material they are hearing, while simultaneously relating it to their own experiences. When they discuss the text with the adult, they can predict and summarize story events, become critical about the topic by questioning and elaborating on their own understanding of the contents of the text and test possible generalizations of text ideas. The role of the adult in book reading sessions follows Vygotsky's (1979) notion of helping the child learn within a zone in which the child is a beginner, and the adult supports as well as guides the child while at the same time gradually relinquishing responsibility:

> At first the novice participates more or less as a spectator responsible for very little of the actual work. But as she becomes more experienced and capable of performing at a higher level, the expert guides her to increasingly more competent performance. The teacher and student come to share the cognitive work load equally. Finally, the adult fades herself out, as it were, leaving the student to take over, and the adult teacher to assume the role of a sympathetic coach. (Reeve, Palincsar, & Brown, 1985, p. 16).

Drawing on these concepts and applying them to book reading, it is possible that teachers can gradually shift the responsibility of understanding and interpreting written language to their young students. The role shift might take place by (a) modeling text comprehension through expressive oral reading and discussion of story characters' feelings and actions, (b) demonstrating how things work and how they are related to concepts presented in informational texts, (c) showing comprehension strategies through discussions with students about what a particular word or phrase means, (d) diagnosing students' comprehension difficulties during the book reading by stopping to ask questions and interpret or expand on the text and on their answers, and (e) assigning students more responsibility for text interpretation by encouraging comments and questions about the text, by

having them read parts of the text, by arranging for them to act out important story incidents, and by setting aside time for them to write or draw pictures about interesting story events.

To what extent is there evidence that children are read to in these elaborate ways and that the approaches help them form constructs about written language? Research shows a relationship between parents who read to their children and children's later reading achievement. According to Snow (1983), parents provide literate, "decontextualized language" features in their story reading. These features include acquainting children with an impersonal author, a distant setting, varying points of view of characters, and written language forms. Studying her son's early language acquisition, Snow found the routine of book reading ideal for learning language. Because the events of each page are the same each time the book is opened and can be used for discussion, the child can gradually take on more and more of the adult role in the reading situation. The child is provided with the chance to learn the rules for reading and acquire knowledge of written language features.

Corroboration of the value of parental reading to children comes from Wells (1982, 1986) who made a retrospective accounting of 7-year-olds' academic achievement in reading, math, and vocabulary. Using interviews with parents, one when the children were 5, prior to school entry, and one from when the children were 7. Wells gathered information on home influences of the first two years of schooling. Variables significantly correlated with reading attainment at age 7 were: parent interest and help with school work, child oral language production, child knowledge of and interest in literacy, and time spent listening to stories read aloud. Wells concluded that book reading between parents and their children was a primary factor in children's later reading achievement.

The evidence that book reading to children in school makes a difference requires further investigation, in part because large-scale correlational studies have found that book reading is not related to progress in reading (Meyer, Linn, & Hastings, 1988; Rosenshine & Stevens, 1984). However, experimental studies have found that book reading helps students in their reading. In one such study, Feitelson, Kita, and Goldstein (1986) showed that reading to kindergarten and first grade children speeds their progress in learning to read. In one study, kindergarten teachers who read to their students four times a week for four months found that they were better able to understand, recall, and tell stories. In a study with first grade children, higher word reading and reading comprehension scores were obtained when teachers read reading stories to them.

In another experimental study that followed Headstart children through kindergarten, McCormick and Mason (1986) found that reading little books (Mason & McCormick, 1984) to children at school, mailing the books home to the children during the Headstart year, and then mailing the books home during kindergarten without school previewing had a long-lasting effect on children's later reading.

Further evidence that reading to children in school is beneficial comes from a descriptive study (Peterman, Mason, & Dunning, 1985), two experimental studies (Peterman, Dunning, Eckerty, & Mason, 1987), and a doctoral dissertation (Peterman, 1987). These studies involved microanalyses of ongoing teacher-student discussion during book reading sessions. The quality of this talk was judged and compared to students' recall of stories and their ability to read portions of them. Results in all three studies indicated that the quality of the teacher-student story discussion affected students' story recall, and the descriptive study also showed that some kinds of discussion helped students when they tried to read selected pages from the story.

## Reading to Children and Writing Connections

How might young children be encouraged to write in ways that would help them learn about written language features? Sulzby (1985) found that children, who were from homes where literacy was supported, knew how to form some, if not all, of the letters of the alphabet. They knew how writing should appear on paper and that it conveys meaning. They appeared to use "this awareness to indicate what should get read in storybooks, although when they tried to read those books

themselves, most of the children did not keep their eyes on print" (Sulzby, 1985, p. 192). She found that when requested to write stories, they tended to use a form of writing which differed from conventional orthography. They were aware of the effort needed to write a story and the children usually reverted to pretend-writing or a much-abbreviated form of writing. Their writing took the forms of drawing, scribbling, letter-like forms, strings of well learned elements, and invented spelling, as well as conventional spelling.

Several investigators have examined connections between reading achievement and writing. Chomsky (1972) describes the value of invented spelling in first grade because it allows children to see how letters represent sounds in words, thus aiding decoding. According to Clark (1976) and Durkin (1966), children who began to write before they went to school were more likely later to be better readers. Furthermore, Clay (1975, p. 70), suggests that writing "plays a significant part in the early reading progress." In a 1982 paper, Clay explains how writing influences reading progress. Writing provides "synthetic experience where letters are built into words which make up sentences . . . [because] when a child writes she has to know the sound-symbol relationship inherent in reading" (p. 208). Writing helps children organize and figure out written language features, an activity which Clay found was particularly effective if children were also being taught a number of different strategies for analyzing words. Finally, she explained that having children share their stories with classmates provides a framework within which to write and a purpose for writing.

One aspect of research on reading to children and their writing attempts that has been virtually ignored is the effect of reading different types of books to children. In this paper we address the effects on children when teachers read different kinds of books to kindergarten children. We chose three kinds of texts: a narrative (a story that contained fictional characters who confronted and solved a problem), an expository text (a science text about what shadows are, how they are formed, and why they are useful), and a little book (a six page illustrated set of statements that focused on the familiar event of getting ready for bed, and contained a small number of words on each page).

Our purpose was to understand the extent to which a book type affects children's ability to recall, write about, and read the text that their teacher has just read to them. In addition, because each child was asked to read, write, and recall information from three books, we had enough data from each child to measure the extent to which reading and writing about a book are related to one another and to story recall.

## Research Method

Of the six teachers involved in this study, five worked at schools in a small midwestern city and one taught in a rural area. One of the schools was in a working class neighborhood but because it was a magnet school with a full day kindergarten program, it included a number of bussed-in middle class students. The remaining city schools were in middle-class neighborhoods and had half-day kindergarten programs. These experienced teachers agreed to participate in the study so that we could learn how their story reading techniques affected children's recall and ability to read and write portions of it.

Although all of the children in the 6 classrooms participated in storybook reading sessions (139 children), we could not individually test this large number. We asked each teacher to choose 10 of their students who represented their average achievers for us to test. Eight of the 60 children missed some of the reading sessions, and so the analyses we describe in this paper are based on 52 children's test responses to three book reading sessions.

The six teachers agreed to read three books to their whole classes in their usual manner as we videotaped each reading. they read the books on three successive days during the spring semester. We chose a narrative, *Strega Nona*, by Tommie DePaola, an expository text, *Shadows, Here, There, and Everywhere*, by Ron and Nancy Goor, and a little book, *Time for Bed*, by Christine McCormick

and Jana Mason. We placed the video camera in the classroom prior to each book reading and it remained stationary throughout the lesson. The camera was focused primarily on the teacher, with the children partially visible.

Immediately after the story was read, we took the preselected children from the classroom one by one to tell us about the book they had just heard. Every child agreed to come and talk to us. Firstly, they were given a blank piece of paper and choice of pencil or crayon and asked to write anything that they could remember from the book they had just heard. They were encouraged to write something even if they did not know how to spell correctly. Then, we asked questions about the book. Lastly, we showed children several pages from the book. There were four pages each from the narrative text (46 words), the expository text (30 words), and the entire six page text of the little book (19 words). We asked them to read as much of each page as they could. If they could not read, we asked them to pretend-read it.

The entire testing took from 5 to 10 minutes per child, depending on the amount of time each child spent in writing or trying to sound out words. Reactions of the children to the test situation varied from intense concentration on every aspect of each task by some of the children, to mild disinterest on the part of others, but in only one case did a child refuse to do any of the writing or answer any of the questions. Many of the children, when asked to do the writing task, said at first that they could not read or write or spell, but when we explained that they could pretend that they were writing, most of them made some attempt, ranging from pictures, to a few letters with no recognizable relation to one another, to complete sentences. Reactions to book questions varied from "I don't know" by a few children to almost complete retellings of the book by others; most gave brief answers. On the reading task, some children attempted to sound out each word on the page, some pretended to read, and others used the accompanying picture as a reference for retelling the part of the story depicted by the picture.

When the data had been collected, we had 17 pages of information from each of 52 children and few guidelines about how to score or interpret them. An example of one child's responses is included with the explanations of the scoring systems used. Since our goal was to learn in what ways children's reading and writing responses were similar and different across readings of different books, we needed to develop scoring systems that would allow comparisons even though the texts differed substantially in length and complexity.

We used three methods of scoring children's writing. One method measures the quality of children's ability to write and is a modified version of Sulzby's scale (1985). An 11-point scale was formed (Table 1) and evaluated for inter-rater reliability (96%). One rule that simplified the scoring was to assign the highest possible value when children produced more than one type of writing.

**[Insert Table 1 about here.]**

For example, one child, Kendra, whose writing for *Shadows: Here, There, and Everywhere* included a picture (Level 1), words unrelated to the book (Level 0), and "SDE" for "Shadows" (Level 5), earned a Level 5 score. This exemplifies one of our assumptions, which was also used by Allen (in press), of assigning a score representing children's highest level response when they write several things, because this is a fair way to describe their writing ability. Another assumption, that a zero is an appropriate score for responses which are unrelated to the text (e.g., child's name or favorite words such as CAT) if no other writing is produced, was followed because we had expressly asked children to write something about the book.

Although the writing quality scale rated children's movement toward the construction of conventional words and sentences, it disregarded differences in the children's talk about what they had written (reliability of scoring was 89%). For this reason we developed a scale that focussed on the quality of their talk about what they had written. A 6-point scale described levels of

sophistication of their talk about their writing. The children's talk was scored independently from their writing ability. Hence, a child could secure a high score on her talk about her writing, even if she drew a picture.

**[Insert Table 2 about here.]**

To illustrate, Kendra was given a 4 on her talk about the little book written response because her comments, were relevant to the text but did not describe the text sequence. She simply described what she wrote, saying, "Time for Bed, Sleep tight. Can I write 'Get a hug?' Get a hug."

In a separate unpublished report, Kerr determined another way to analyze the writing attempts. She distinguished the content of the writing by categorizing the topic or content of each sample. Six categories were identified (Table 3). On the little book, Kendra wrote about two events, "time for bed" and "get a hug," and one concept, "sleep tight."

**[Insert table 3 about here.]**

To score children's attempts to read the text, in which they were shown copies of book pages that included the accompanying pictures, two scores were constructed. The first score counted the number of words read correctly. Each correctly reported word received one point, even if the child only looked at picture information instead of the printed words. This raw score rewarded children who read the text as well as those who "pretend-read" and talked about the information using words that appeared on the page. A proportional score was computed based on the number of words on the pages (the child's raw score divided by the number of words appearing on the pages being read).

A second score evaluated the quality of the reading in terms of use of conventional reading strategies, and so ranked children's movement toward a mature reading approach. This scale (Table 4) extended Sulzby's scale (1985) with research based on our current work. Reliabilities for scoring was 95%.

**[Insert Table 4 about here.]**

Kendra read the little book text remarkably well with a raw score of 14 words correct out of 19 possible, a .73 proportional score on word reading. Since she was attending to more than half, but less than three quarters, of the print she received a rank of 8 on her movement toward conventional reading strategies.

To score children's text recall, children's answers to our questions about the content of each book were conservatively interpreted. All answers that mentioned portions of the text were separated into idea units. Each unique idea unit received one point. These were summed across the several answers to obtain an overall raw recall score. Then, because the narrative contained 89 idea units, the expository text contained 50, and the little book contained only 5, a proportional score (the child's raw score divided by the number of text idea units) was also computed. Kendra received one point for her little book recall, "brushes her teeth," and one point for "reads a story." Her proportional score was 2/5 or .40.

## Research Results

Substantial differences were found in children's responses to the three books. To put these differences in a classroom context, we summarized the teacher-student talk from the videotaped book reading sessions (Mason, Peterman, & Kerr, in press). The analyses revealed that the teachers provided quite different information for the three books. Teachers typically introduced the narrative with comments about the title, author, and setting information. During the story reading, they asked many questions about vocabulary, characters, and interpretation of events. Closing remarks dealt

with resolution of the story. The expository text generated less discussion throughout, with teachers explaining and demonstrating text concepts before and during the reading and arranging follow-up activities that extended some of the book concepts. During the reading they frequently had children look at and label the illustrations as a way to understand the text ideas. Teachers typically introduced the little book text by asking children to relate their own experiences to the text content (getting ready for bed) and encouraging them to look at the print. After the reading some teachers allowed children to read with them and others had children act out the events.

We expected that children would read, write, and recall different aspects of the books they had just heard. In other words, and as Sulzby, Barnhart and Hieshima (in press) discuss, we did not expect to find uniform scores for each child. Instead we expected that the ease or difficulty of the book itself, as well as differences in the way the teacher presented the book, would affect the level and completeness of children's responses.

We confirmed that the little book was more completely remembered than either the narrative or exposition when relying on a proportional score. Children recalled an average of .80 of the little book ideas but only between .14 and .20 of the ideas in the other two books. Not unexpectedly, raw score differences favored the narrative. Children recalled twice as many narrative idea units as expository text units, and nearly twice as many expository as little book text units. Table 5 presents the average values.

**[Insert Table 5 about here.]**

The little book was easier for children to read than the other two books, based both on raw and proportional scores. Children had .80 of the words correct with the little book, .26 with the narrative, and .30 with the exposition. These differences are not surprising since the teachers pointed out the print as they read and encouraged children to read portions of the little book but not the other two books. The reading strategy score corroborated this finding. Children achieved a higher ranking on their reading of the little book than on the other two books. With the little book, children were likely to be moderately or nearly successful at attending to and identifying words. With the other two texts they were more likely to make up stories using both oral and written language-like phrases and to rely on the pictures rather than the print. Thus, when asked to read a book with few words, large print, useful pictures and a familiar experience, children were able to stretch toward conventional reading in the testing situation.

When comparing the quality of form of writing and talk about what they had written, we found unexpectedly small differences across the text types. All three texts generated quite similar results. Average values on the writing attempt indicated that a typical response was to write letters rather than words. The typical writing talk response was to label a single idea about the book. Kerr then did a content analysis of the writing attempts and found large differences across book types. Children were more likely to write about text events and characters with the narrative, to present concepts with the expository text, and identify text events with the little book (Table 6).

**[Insert Table 6 about here.]**

Correlations among the measures helped to determine the relationships between children's reading and writing attempts. We analyzed whether children who obtained higher reading scores also obtained higher writing scores and whether low scores in one occurred with the other. This information is summarized in Tables 7, 8, and 9 because the analyses were carried out separately for each book.

**[Insert Tables 7, 8, & 9 about here.]**

First, we report that the two reading measures were highly correlated with each other and that the two writing measures were moderately intercorrelated. The reading measures were nearly interchangeable measures of reading, and the two writing measures provided overlapping but somewhat different information about children's writing. Reading and writing were moderately well related for the narrative and expository text (Tables 7 & 8), with correlation values in the middle range (.41 to .55). The little book correlations (Table 9) were lower (.06 to .33), indicating that little book word reading attempts were poorly related to writing attempts and not at all related to writing talk. Correlations between recall and both reading and writing are also presented in these tables. They indicate that neither reading nor writing was related to recall.

## Interpretation of Research Results

Children were strongly affected by the type of book that their teacher read to them. When they heard a narrative or an expository text they recalled proportionally much less, read fewer words, and used less effective reading strategies than when they heard a little book. Furthermore, although their writing attempts and talk levels were similar across the three book types, the content of their writing changed. Why might this have occurred?

The expository and narrative texts are similar to one another and different from the little book text in many ways: length, print form, text complexity, content familiarity, and usefulness of illustrations (for word recognition). In a sense, children were flooded with print and given too few clues even to attempt reading the narrative or exposition. Not so with the little book, for those words were easily seen. When the teachers read the book, the words were limited in number and were connected to pictures in ways that served as reminders for children when they were tested.

Book type differences were strengthened by the teachers' reading approaches. They set up good listening activities for the narrative, interesting picture- and object-viewing experiences around the exposition, and print-reading attempts for the little book. They all read the books to their students, but added activities and discussion topics that changed the listening experiences.

These large differences in reading were mirrored in the book type recalls. Children recalled proportionally larger amounts of the little book than of the other two books. The actual amount recalled was greatest for the narrative and then for the expository text, though this can be explained in part by the amount of text that was available to recall and in part by the differences in the number of questions asked about the books.

What becomes a surprise, then, is why the writing levels did not change with book type. Neither dissimilar book sessions nor unlike book forms affected children's writing attempts or talk. It only changed the content of the writing. Why? The possibility we offer is that writing attempts and talk about that writing are less affected by teachers' book reading than are reading attempts when children are just entering into literacy. At that time, writing may affect reading but reading and book listening do not affect writing. This possibility is carefully presented and supported by Dobson (in press). She found that at early reading levels, writing activity helps to change reading, while at higher reading levels, reading, and (we add) book listening help to improve writing. The children in this study were at Dobson's earlier levels, and so their writing was not affected by listening to books.

The relationships among reading, writing, and recall were also evaluated. We found moderate correlations between reading and writing for the narrative and expository text, but we found low or no correlations between reading and writing for the little book. Furthermore, there were no correlations between either reading and recall or writing and recall. Moderate correlations for the narrative and expository books support the proposition that reading and writing abilities are related and that they emerge together, or as Dobson showed, with writing ability emerging before reading ability. Low correlations for the little book indicate that reading but not writing was changed by the simple text. The little book only made reading, not writing, much easier. Hence, the true relationship

between reading and writing was obscured. The low correlations between recall and reading and recall and writing cannot be explained in this study. It could mean that children learning to read and write do not necessarily recall the ideas from the book they just heard, or it could mean that we have a poor measure of children's memory of the book. We would like to believe that book recall is independent of reading and writing at this age. That is, young children begin to figure out letters, sounds, words and write them down without necessarily being able to understand and remember stories that they have heard. Further research is needed to evalute this possibility.

## Instructional Implications

This study suggests that the kinds of books kindergarten teachers read to their students and how they read them can affect students' recall, their attempts to read, and the content of their writing about it. It seems unlikely to affect how they write. These conclusions are based on the assumption that teachers employ some of the Vygotskian book reading approaches that were described at the beginning of this paper.

When reading a narrative, teachers can focus on the story problem and the series of events that lead to its resolution. They can relate the story content to children's knowledge about similar situations and encourage children to make predictions about subsequent story events. After reading they can help children summarize the important story ideas and arrange follow-up activities such as writing, drawing, and acting out story events. When reading an expository text, they can help children build knowledge of the major text concepts and accompanying new terms. They can help children focus on the key ideas through demonstration and visual props, highlighting relationships among the ideas and clarifying the value of the concepts for children. When reading a little book, a book that features a briefly-told, simply illustrated familiar event, they can place the book pages in clear view, read it more than once, and encourage participation in the reading. They can extend the book ideas by encouraging children to relate text events to their own background knowledge. Follow-up activities can include writing, rewriting or extending the story line, as well as constructing student-designed little books.

Kindergarten teachers can follow book reading with opportunities to read or pretend, read and write or draw. The activities help children focus on written texts, and because the responses will vary with the type of book, explorations about written text differences will take place.

## References

Allen, J. (in press). Reading and writing development in whole language kindergartens. In J. Mason (Ed.), *Reading and writing connections*. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Chomsky, C. (1972). Stages in language development and reading exposure. *Harvard Educational Review, 42*, 1-33.

Clark, M. (1976). *Young fluent readers: What can they teach us*? Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M. (1975). *What did I write*? Auckland, New Zealand: Educational Books.

Clay, M. (1982). *Observing young readers: Selected papers*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

DePaola, T. (1975). *Strega Nona*. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Dobson, L. (in press). Connections in learning to write and read: A study of children's development through kindergarten and grade one. In J. Mason (Ed.), *Reading and writing connections*. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Durkin, D. (1966). *Children who read early: Two longitudinal studies*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Feitelson, D., Kita, B., & Goldstein, Z. (1986). Effects of listening to series stories on first grader's comprehension and use of language. *Research in the Teaching of English, 20*, 339-356.

Goor, R., & N. (1981). *Shadows: Here, there and everywhere* (1st ed.), New York: Crowell.

Harste, J., Woodward, V., Burke, C. (1984). *Language stories and literacy lessons*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

McCormick, C., & Mason, J. M. (1986). *Use of little books at home: A minimal intervention strategy for fostering early reading* (Tech. Rep. No. 388). Urbana: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.

Mason, J. M., & McCormick, C. (1984). *Little books for early readers*. Champaign, IL: Pint-sized Prints.

Mason, J. M., & McCormick, C. (1984). *Time for bed*. Champaign, IL: Pint-sized Prints.

Mason, J. M., Peterman, C., Kerr, B. M. (in press). *Reading to kindergarten children: Book talk time*.

Meyer, L. A., Linn, R. L., & Hastings, C. N. (1988). *Teachers' reading to students correlates negatively with students' achievement in reading: Why might this be*? Manuscript submitted for publication.

Perena, K. (1984). *Children's writing and reading: Analyzing classroom language*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Peterman, C. L., Mason, J. M., & Dunning, D. (1985). *The storybook reading event: How a teacher's presentation affects kindergarten children's attempts to read*. Paper presented at 1985 National Reading Conference, San Diego, CA.

Peterman, C. L., Dunning, D., Eckerty, C., & Mason, J. M. (1987). *The effects of storyreading procedures collaboratively designed by teacher and researcher on kindergarteners' literacy learning.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Associations Conference, Washington DC.

Peterman, C. (1987). *The effects of storyreading procedures collaboratively designed by teachers and researcher on kindergarteners' literacy learning.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana.

Reeve, R., Palincsar, A., & Brown, A. (1985). *Everyday and academic thinking: Implications for learning and problem solving* (Tech. Rep. No. 349). Urbana: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.

Rosenshine, B., & Stevens, R. (1984). Classroom instruction in reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook in reading research* (pp. 745-798). NY: Longman.

Snow, C. (1983). Literacy and language: Relationships during the preschool years. *Harvard Educational Review, 53*, 165-189.

Snow, C., & Ninio, A. (1986). The contracts of literacy: What children learn from learning to read books. In W. H. Teale & E. Sulzby (Eds.), *Emerging literacy: Writing and reading* (pp. 116-138). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Sulzby, E. (1985). Kindergarteners as writers and readers. In M. Farr (Ed.), *Advances in writing research, volume one: Children's early writing development* (pp. 127-200). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Sulzby, E., Barnhart, J., & Hieshima, J. (in press). Forms of writing and prereading from writing: A preliminary report. In J. Mason (Ed.), *Reading and writing connections*. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Vygotsky, L. (1979). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wells, G. (1982). Story reading and the development of symbolic skills. *Australian Journal of Reading, 5*, 142-152.

Wells, G. (1986). *The meaning makers: Children learning language and using language to learn.* Porthsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

**Table 1**

**Ranking of Children's Writing Attempts That Are Related to the Book Reading**

0. No response or unrelated to task
1. Picture
2. Nonpicture: scribble
3. Single letter-like forms
4. Multiple letters, either not word-like or copied
5. Word-like, containing prominant consonants, usually initial ones, and more than half of all letter pairs in the invented spelling must be possible English combinations
6. Isolated word(s) with good attempt at spelling: more than 50% of phonemes are in the word and the child says what it means
7. Single sentence or phrase
8. Unrelated multiple sentences or phrases
9. Event-related sentences or phrases
10. Story-related sentences

**Table 2**

**Ranking of Children's Talk About Their Writing**

1. Does not talk about the writing
2. Describes the writing but does not relate it to the book
3. Relates the writing to the book with labels or naming a single idea
4. Relates the writing to book labels or several ideas about the book but does not connect the ideas
5. Connects the writing to the book with several ideas using event sequence, part/whole, cause/effect, or statement/example
6. Tells a story about the book using the written product

**Table 3**

**Categories Describing the Content or Topic of What the Child Wrote**

Text concept: abstract and general text idea
Text object: specific, relatively concrete item from book
Text event: an action in the book
Text character: person in the book
Text setting: a place where the story or events take place
Other: Writing produced but child admits it does not say or mean anything or which is unrelated to the book (child's name, "Mom," or "I love you")

**Table 4**

**Ranking of Children's Reading Attempts**

1. Repeats one word or phrase throughout
2. Labels each picture with single labels
3. Embellishes on the labels, describing pictures as isolated events
4. Primitive story is formed using oral language like phrases and picture information
5. Story is formed with written language-like phrases: repeats some phrases from the book
6. Attempts to use print on the page by picking known words on the page, but attempt results in disconnected ideas
7. Tries to integrate by filling in with made up words, mumble reading unknown words, and using picture information, but reads fewer than 50% of words correctly
8. Moderately successful at reading words and integrating book ideas, with 50 to 74% of words read correctly
9. Nearly successful at reading and integrating book ideas, with 75 to 84% of words read correctly
10. Successful at reading and integrating book ideas, with 85 to 100% of words read correctly

**Table 5**

**Average Values for Children's Recall of Book Information and Their Attempts to Read and Write.**

| | Narrative | Exposition | Little Book |
|---|---|---|---|
| Raw score recall | 12.15 | 6.01 | 3.98 |
| Proportion recall | .14 | .12 | .80 |
| Raw score word reading | 11.92 | 9.08 | 15.27 |
| Proportion score word reading | .26 | .30 | .80 |
| Word reading level | 5.10 | 4.73 | 8.90 |
| Writing attempt | 3.92 | 4.21 | 4.37 |
| Talk about writing | 3.21 | 2.73 | 3.08 |

**Table 6**

**Text Content: Frequencies and Percent of Responses**

| Category | Book Type | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Narrative | | Exposition | | Little Book | |
| | Freq. | % | Freq. | % | Freq. | % |
| Text Concept | 14 | 14 | 54 | 62 | 15 | 15 |
| Text Object | 16 | 16 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 15 |
| Text Event | 32 | 31 | 2 | 2 | 42 | 41 |
| Character | 23 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Setting | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 17 | 17 | 27 | 31 | 30 | 29 |
| Total: | 102 | | 87 | | 102 | |

Note. Totals do not equal one writing sample per child because some children wrote more than one item and other children wrote none.

**Table 7**

**Reading, Writing, and Recall Score Intercorrelations for the Narrative Text**

| | Writing Attempt | Writing Talk | Word Reading Raw Score | Word Reading Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Writing Attempt | -- | | | |
| Writing Talk | .65 | -- | | |
| Word Reading Raw Score | .47 | .41 | -- | |
| Word Reading Level | .47 | .44 | .84 | -- |
| Raw Score Recall | .18 | .33 | .17 | .27 |

**Table 8**

**Reading, Writing, and Recall Score Intercorrelations for the Expository Text**

| | Writing Attempt | Writing Talk | Word Reading Raw Score | Word Reading Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Writing Attempt | -- | | | |
| Writing Talk | .62 | -- | | |
| Word Reading Raw Score | .55 | .46 | -- | |
| Word Reading Level | .49 | .43 | .86 | -- |
| Raw Score Recall | .05 | .26 | .14 | .22 |

**Table 9**

**Reading, Writing, and Recall Score Intercorrelations for the Little Book**

| | Writing Attempt | Writing Talk | Word Reading Raw Score | Word Reading Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Writing Attempt | -- | | | |
| Writing Talk | .68 | -- | | |
| Word Reading Raw Score | .33 | .07 | -- | |
| Word Reading Level | .30 | .06 | .89 | |
| Raw Score Recall | .10 | .14 | .15 | .16 |